

EXHIBIT H



CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ LLP

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

Brian R. Lemon
TEL (302) 888-6319
FAX (302) 658-6246
EMAIL blemon@cblh.com
REPLY To Wilmington Office

WILMINGTON, DE

The Nemours Building
1007 North Orange St.
P.O. Box 2207
Wilmington, DE 19899
TEL: (302) 658 9141
FAX: (302) 658 5614
WEB: www.cblh.com

May 7, 2008

VIA FACSIMILE AND U.S. MAIL

Daniel A. Griffith, Esquire
Whiteford Taylor & Preston
1220 N. Market Street
Suite 608
Wilmington, DE 19801

Re: **Curry v. Hopkins (C.A. 1:04-CV-00175-JJF)**

Dear Daniel:

On May 5, 2008, we received the Defendant's responses to the Plaintiff's Second Set of Interrogatories (Nos. 1-10). This letter illustrates defects in some of the responses. Please supplement the following responses in the manner described without further delay.

Interrogatory No. 6: This interrogatory requests specific facts about the Defendant's employment at Sugarloaf Farms, including dates of employment and the names of co-workers. None are provided. Please supplement your response without further delay.

Interrogatory No. 7: This interrogatory asks for a description of every instance in which the Defendant has been accused of police brutality, etc. In response, the Defendant only refers to documents regarding the arrest of Reginald Jenkins. Defendant does not describe this specific instance. Also, no other instance is mentioned. Since no objection to this request was made, we will assume there has been no other instance. Please supplement your response without further delay.

Interrogatory No. 8: This interrogatory seeks an explanation of the proper procedure in using a K-9 unit during the arrest or apprehension of a suspect. In response, the Defendant purports to have provided a copy of the Dover Police Department's policies and procedures to the Plaintiff in November 2005. However, no manuals or procedures have ever been produced. Further, no explanation of the proper procedures is given. Please supplement your response without further delay.



Daniel A. Griffith, Esquire
May 7, 2008
Page 2

Interrogatory No. 9: This interrogatory seeks the identity of persons who have knowledge of the allegations stated in the Plaintiff's amended complaint. The Defendant failed to properly identify any person. The definition of "identify" found in the Plaintiff's Second Set of Interrogatories sets forth information needed to fully respond to this interrogatory, including, but not limited to, names, titles and addresses. Please supplement your response without further delay.

Interrogatory No. 10: The Defendant simply responds to this interrogatory by stating "To be provided." The Defendant did not seek an extension of time in which to respond to this interrogatory. Please supplement your response without further delay.

Sincerely,

Brian R. Lemon

cc: Scott E. Swenson, Esquire
Mr. Joseph Curry